An Open Letter to the United Kingdom: I Will Not Submit My American Speech to a Foreign Public-Good Test

Douglas C. Youvan

doug@youvan.com www.youvan.ai June 30, 2026

I write this open letter as a matter of conscience, scholarship, and free speech. I have published more than 5,600 AI-assisted papers, preprints, essays, and research arguments through ResearchGate. Google Scholar has indexed many of these works, and modern AI search systems have made the corpus increasingly searchable, catalogued, and externally legible. That visibility is intentional. I have not hidden my arguments, my political judgments, my religious reasoning, my criticism of institutions, or my opposition to war, censorship, and imperial management of public discourse.

I am pro-Palestine. I am pro-Russia in the sense that I oppose the reduction of Russia to an enemy caricature and oppose the escalation of NATO-centered policy toward catastrophic war. I reject terrorism, attacks on civilians, antisemitism, collective punishment, political assassination, hostage-taking, and war crimes. I support speech, historical argument, diplomacy, national self-determination, and the right of citizens to criticize their own governments and foreign governments without being transformed into security objects.

The United Kingdom's use of a "not conducive to the public good" immigration standard reveals a deeper problem than any single exclusion case. The phrase sounds administrative, but it is a political judgment. It grants state officials the power to treat lawful foreign speech as a discretionary border risk. A writer, scholar, journalist, activist, religious critic, or political dissident may speak in his own country, under his own constitutional tradition, and later discover that a foreign government has converted that speech into a reason for exclusion.

I do not accept that moral arrangement.

No foreign ministry, border official, security desk, or political appointee has legitimate authority over the conscience of an American writer speaking lawfully from within the United States. The United Kingdom may, of course, control its own borders. That is its sovereign right. But sovereignty cuts both ways. If the United Kingdom reserves the right to exclude foreign writers for lawful political speech, then foreign writers retain the right to refuse the dignity of voluntary participation in that system.

Therefore, I state plainly: I will not step foot in the United Kingdom again.

This is not a plea for admission. It is not an appeal for reconsideration. It is not a request to be placed on a more acceptable list of manageable dissidents. It is a refusal. I will not ask permission to enter a country that claims the right to judge whether my lawful speech, published openly in the United States, is “conducive” to its public good.

The phrase “public good” should not be used as a diplomatic mask for censorship. It should not become a transnational loyalty test. It should not be used to punish criticism of Israel, NATO, Ukraine policy, Russia policy, British foreign policy, American foreign policy, or any other state project. The proper answer to political speech is more speech, not border exclusion, reputational blacklisting, or administrative intimidation.

A free society should be able to tolerate critics who are wrong, severe, inconvenient, eccentric, prophetic, unpopular, or untimely. It should be able to distinguish criticism from incitement, sympathy for civilians from endorsement of armed groups, historical analysis from propaganda, and dissent from criminality. When a state loses those distinctions, it does not become safer. It becomes more brittle.

My archive is public. My positions are public. My name is public. My authorship is public. I have chosen publication over secrecy. If that record is too large, too controversial, too independent, too pro-Palestine, too skeptical of NATO, too critical of empire, too sympathetic to negotiated peace, or too hostile to censorship for the United Kingdom’s comfort, then the conclusion is simple: the United Kingdom is not a venue I need.

I will continue to publish. I will continue to criticize. I will continue to defend the right of others to speak, including those with whom I disagree. I will continue to oppose the globalization of censorship and the conversion of immigration law into an ideological filter. I will not trim my speech to satisfy the hypothetical mood of a foreign border officer.

The United Kingdom may keep its “public good” test.

I will keep my speech.

Douglas C. Youvan

Frontenac, Kansas USA